

*Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary*

Date: December 6, 2012

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Steve Petersen, Commissioner
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner
Scott Kozak, Commissioner
Joe Coath, Commissioner
Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson

Staff Members: Kevin Kramer, Planner
Jean Emerick, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Chairperson O'Donnell called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Roll call noted the following: Steve Petersen, present (arrived at 7:07 pm); Karen Plummer, present; Patrick Lytle, present; Scott Kozak, present; Chris Geissler, absent; Vice-Chairperson Joe Coath, present; Chairperson Marty O'Donnell, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings and swore in those individuals that wished to speak.

New Business

ARC 12-10: Barrington Village Center – Final Approval

Owner: Village of Barrington
200 S Hough Street
Barrington, IL 60010

Developer: Arthur Hill & Co.
900 Clark Street
Evanston, IL 60201

Architect: HKM Architects+Planners
43 S Vail Avenue
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

The petitioner is seeking a certificate of approval for redevelopment of the site at the southwest corner of Hough and Main Streets. The Petitioner proposes to construct two buildings on the site; one on the west side of the site, in a similar location as the former Chuck Hines store (Building #1) and another L-shaped building on the corner of Hough and Main Streets (Building #2). Building #1 is proposed as a one-story building, while Building 2 is two stories with an alternate proposal for a third story over the Main Street side of the building. The property is zoned B-4 Village Center District.

A preliminary meeting for this petition was held on November 8, 2012. The ARC gave positive feedback for the design of Building #2 but was concerned about the height and mass of the three-story alternate. The Commission asked the petitioner to provide street section views and an accurate 3-D model of the site to depict how the new buildings will fit with the existing downtown. The ARC felt that Building #1 did not fit in with Building #2 or with the rest of the downtown. The petitioner has resubmitted a new design for Building #1 taking into account the ARC recommendations.

Commissioner Petersen arrived at 7:07 pm.

Mr. Hopkins, HKM Architects+Planners, said they have revised Building #1 with materials and details. The revised design for Building #1 is an all new design. It has the same footprint, the same façade bumps. It will have two facades rather than three. They have broken the rhythm and height. There will be a natural stone base with cast stone cap on it. The colors are slightly different. There is a wrought iron store front, molded lintels. The east side will have an outdoor dining area. There are meter enclosures that will be painted out to match the brick. All sides will be front sides. On the west side there will be stairs to bring the sidewalk up to grade. The window pattern will have the same spacing. There are two different light fixtures from one component to the next, gooseneck and lantern. The RTUs will be concealed by the parapet. They have added transom windows. He showed the samples of the hardy board, stone, brick, roof, and lintel.

Commissioner Petersen asked if there was a reason why they weren't using smooth. The Commission likes the smooth.

Mr. Miller asked what the material the lap board was.

Chairperson O'Donnell answered that it was hardy board or cementitious siding.

Mr. Hopkins said for Building #2, there are eight elevations in the packet, four for the two-story and four for the three-story. Building #2 is an L-shaped building. There is a variety of roof and parapet shapes. It will be a continuation of the downtown streetscape and an assembly of

smaller components. There are a number of materials that will help to break it down. There will be a combination of stone and brick with an all-stone gable end. They will not know what the awning designs will be until the building is leased. It will probably be a mix depending upon the tenants. On the second floor there is a stucco-type hardy panel and trim design. They chose a darker color scheme to appear more historic. On Hough Street, the tower is to the left of the pedestrian portal. The landscape will be a buffer between the sidewalk and the street and it will also help with the grades, which drop from north to south along Hough Street.

On the south elevation, there is a site wall and steps at the end of the sidewalk. The grades also drop along Station Street. There are meter enclosures along the back of the building, as well as an entrance to the offices.

Mr. Hopkins presented the elevations for the three-story option. The tower is moved to the corner of Hough and Main Streets. South of the portal, the building will remain the same.

Mr. Hopkins presented building sections and samples of materials.

Chairperson O'Donnell asked if all of the mechanicals would be hidden by the roof.

Mr. Hopkins answered that this was their intention. They hope to hide them in the roof areas that are hidden. They selected a slightly different roof for Building #2, different stone, and darker brick. The window will have a wide profile frame that simulates a brick mold.

Commissioner Plummer asked where the pink color sample will go.

Mr. Hopkins answered that it is part of the hardy board (mimicking stucco). This color looks much different outside. The tower will have different stone from Building #1. It picks up colors from brick and trim.

Mr. Hopkins presented the perspective views for the two-story and three-story alternates on the same screen to show the differences.

Chairperson O'Donnell asked for the Village report.

Mr. Kramer said that for ARC 12-10 the petitioner is seeking a certificate of approval for redevelopment of the site at the southwest corner of Hough and Main Streets. They are proposing two buildings. Building #1 is a one-story building. Building #2 is a two story L-shaped building with a three-story option. On November 8, 2012, the ARC gave positive feedback on Building #2, but had some concerns about the height and the mass of the three stories. They asked for street sections and perspective views. The ARC also thought that Building #1 did not quite fit with the downtown, so they asked the petitioner to resubmit a new design for Building #1. The design guidelines are all met. The glazed curtain window system – according to the ordinance a maximum of 15% of the façade should be limited to this design. The ARC provided a direction that this fits with the design of the rest of the building and they did not have an issue with it. An exception will be needed for that and it will go through the

Plan Commission. It says that wood doors are preferred, but states that the design of the door, made of materials other than wood, shall be compatible with the design of the building. As long as they are compatible with the building, it could be allowed. Staff believes that they meet the standards, but wants ARC's opinion. The ARC had asked for a roof plan. Staff believes they have met the standards of the roof design and materials, but would like the ARC's opinion on it. Landscaping and lighting standards are met. Staff recommends approval ARC 12-10.

Chairperson O'Donnell stated that there are two options on this project, a two-story or three-story structure. Ideally, the petitioner is asking for both designs to be approved. He asked how tall Cook Street Plaza is and mentioned that it has an architectural feature. He thinks that the tower on the Hough/Main project is too big to be considered a feature.

Mr. Kramer said that an architectural feature is a 10 x 10 space that is not being used as space. The tower element is larger than 10 x 10, so it cannot be considered an architectural feature. The third story can be up to 52 feet with an extra 5% for an architectural feature. The top part of the tower will not be used as leasable space. The tower is 65 feet to the top. The top at Cook Street Plaza is 55 feet, but the top of the actual wall is 38 feet.

Mr. Kramer said that at the Robertson house, the top of the chimney is 54 feet and the roof is 48 feet. The bell tower at Village Hall is 40 feet. The Barrington Bank and Trust architectural feature is 47 feet.

Commissioner Lytle said he likes the changes on Building #1. He asked if the stone water table is something that would be seen on buildings in town.

Mr. Hopkins said they are creating the illusion of a stone foundation.

Commissioner Plummer asked why Building #1 has two different light fixtures.

Mr. Hopkins answered that it is because there is the illusion of two buildings.

Commissioner Plummer likes the new plan but is not sure about the two fixtures. She is concerned about the pink sample for Building #2. It should be looked at in the daylight at all times of day.

Commissioner Lytle asked for clarification on Building #2. Is there a Dutch gable on the eastside? He does not see it in the current rendering.

Mr. Hopkins said they corrected the incongruity of the two exhibits. He said that both are valid alternates.

Chairperson O'Donnell said the Commission prefers the Dutch gable.

Commissioner Petersen believes that the corner could be a lot stronger to be more successful.

Mr. Hopkins said the space leads up to the tower.

Commissioner Petersen does not know what the element would be. He thinks it just needs something. He is also concerned about the massing of the three-story. Otherwise, he likes what they are doing. He said he likes the changes on Building #1. The lighting may be too small or maybe it is the height that is not right.

Mr. Hopkins said that the gooseneck and lantern fixtures come in various sizes.

Commissioner Petersen said he likes the colors. He would like them to use the same brick on both projects.

Mr. Hopkins said they would like to use larger brick on the larger building.

Commissioner Petersen wants to see the rooftop units on the roof plan. The color scheme seems gloomy. There is no contrast. It is too monochromatic.

Mr. Hopkins explained the process of the color. An automatic selection of materials and color would be more of a buff stone and lighter color brick. They went with darker and richer colors, more similar to what had been used in the past. It will be a landmark building and look as if it is from times past. It should have a sense of presence and history. It should have a character that points back to a different time in history.

Commissioner Petersen said he has problems with the three-story. He does not think it is the right decision. It is 10 feet higher than Cook Street Plaza. He thinks the two-story works better. He thinks they could work a third floor into the roof. He believes it could be designed a better way.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said he appreciates the building and the efforts. His concerns are with the details. He has reservations about the three-story version. He is more comfortable aesthetically with the two-story relative to the Catlow. The economics are important to the project and he is sensitive to that. He likes the two building look of Building #1. He is not sure about the stone base. He does not think it is believable enough. It is not a typical storefront on the wood portion with four large doorways. It is unexpected on a typical storefront built in Barrington.

Commissioner Petersen said that he thinks it looks like an old building that has been repurposed. He thinks it is successful.

Chairperson O'Donnell said he does not like the stone, the simulated foundation.

Commissioner Lytle asked on the three-story, is it the height of it or the concept of the three-story that they have a problem with. They are 14 foot stories. Is there a way to reduce the height of the three stories?

Mr. Hopkins said they want to have a ten-foot ceiling on the first floor, and then there is plenum and structure. There is a nine-foot ceiling for the second floor, and plenum and structure again. They have asked for more than they hope they will use, because they do not have a structural system designed yet. There is also a 20 inch differential between the north slab and the south slab of the building, which adds to their difficulties. They would like to have 2 feet 8 inches from the bottom of the structure and the building space above that. They think they could do floor-to-floor at a minimum of 14 feet 4 inches. They understand that Barrington has its own character, but three stories are modest compared to other communities. Where is Barrington going in the future?

Mr. Kramer reminded the Commission that the Plan Commission will approve three stories because the permitted height is up to 52 feet. The Plan Commission is considering an exception for up to 65 feet. If the floor-to-floors are narrowed to 1 ½ feet, how much difference in the Commission's opinion will the 3 or 4 feet affect the overall mass of the building.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said it would certainly help.

Commissioner Kozak said that Building #1 is a huge improvement. He likes it. He would like to see more materials. He would not mind seeing the light fixtures the same on both sides. He does not like the band over the window. Overall he likes the style and the look of it. He thinks they could make the buildings work together a little better. He also likes the two-story version of building 2. He likes the corner. The three-story with the tower on the corner is too much for the corner. If they do the three-story, they should break it up a little more. He likes Commissioner Petersen's idea of lowering the eave height. He is not a fan of bigger brick. He likes the dark brick with lighter stone.

Chairperson O'Donnell opened the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Ron Flubacher, architect and resident, 418 Valencia Avenue, distributed written commentary on the Hough/Main Redevelopment. His concern is with the mass. He moved here with his family in 1953. The line of businesses is identical to what it was in 1953. The three-story is a nightmare of massing. This will be the central building in downtown. Cook Street Plaza has 12 foot floors; this project has 15' 8" floors. He does not understand all the height. They should be able to take out at least eight feet. The roof creates mass and volume. The ordinance calls for a setback of 8 feet, but they are looking for an exception from that. The setback on Cook Street Plaza works. He still thinks that the parking could go in front. He does not like the way Miller was treated in the process. It destroys the continuity. Lastly, he does not understand the options, such as the exception for underground parking.

Chairperson O'Donnell suggested that Mr. Flubacher talk to the Plan Commission about that.

Mr. Jack Schaefer, 820 Country Drive in Barrington, thanked the Commission for their time. He likes the project, particularly the two-story. He likes the pedestrian portal and the arched window details. He is not fond of the three-story plan with the tower on the corner. He respects the decision to pick a more historic brick; it gives it more historical interest.

Mr. Fred Weinert, 303 East Main Street, asked about the square footage for the two-story and the three-story versions.

Mr. Mark Kursnsky, HKM Architects+Planners, said that the two-story has 37,000 square feet and the three-story has 47,000.

Mr. Weinert hopes the Committee does not feel pressure to make a rushed decision. There are so many exceptions. A trustee said at the Town Hall Meeting that underground parking would not be part of the plan because it would take up too much space for a ramp. At last meeting, he did not believe there was an agreement on the setback for the third floor.

Chairperson O'Donnell said that the Commission took a poll and did not like the idea of a setback.

Mr. Kozel, 1189 South Northwest Highway, said he has concerns about the materials. He does not like the larger brick. At the corner of Deerfield and Waukegan Roads in Waukegan there is a redevelopment, where the buildings are pushed back and the parking is in the front. He thinks this works very well. He also thinks that there is no need to hasten the approval of this project.

Chairperson O'Donnell closed public comment at 9:09 pm.

Commissioner Kozak said the Commission's concerns center around the mass and placement. The Commission does not have the authority to change that.

Mr. Kramer said the ordinance requires rear parking.

Commissioner Kozak said he would not want to see parking in the front. If it was setback farther, they would lose parking. He would not be opposed to underground parking. He prefers the two-story version, but they could come back with options for the three-story.

Chairperson O'Donnell took a poll of the Commission. The Commission prefers two stories and would not approve the three-story, as proposed.

Commissioner Kozak said the Commission is in favor of the Dutch gable version.

Chairperson O'Donnell said they could continue the meeting but there is not enough time to discuss all the detail tonight.

Commissioner Plummer said she feels like she is being pushed to make a decision.

Chairperson O'Donnell asked if there was consensus on the placement of the building.

Commissioner Petersen said he liked Deerfield better before the redevelopment. Pushing the buildings back and adding parking in front would give it the feel of a modern strip mall. He likes the character of buildings close to the street with the parking in the back.

The Commission was in agreement.

Mr. Kramer asked the Commission what they need in order to make a decision.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said they need the profiles and heights.

Mr. Hopkins said what is in question is the floor-to-floor height. They can hit all the profiles and details and commit to and bring in drawings for review. Floor-to-floor height will only change 16 inches maximum.

Commissioner Petersen said that if they change the height, proportions could change dramatically.

Mr. Hopkins said they can commit to the elevation, because this is as big as it would get.

Mr. Kramer said if the structure would change, they would need to come back before the Commission.

Commissioner Kozak asked Commissioner Petersen if he is concerned with approving a portion of the project just to keep the project moving.

Mr. Hopkins wants to get a picture of how the Commission wants them to proceed to next week.

Commissioner Petersen said he does not want to force them to keep going back to the drawing board. He approves the concept and the overall character. He still is not sure exactly what will be built.

Mr. Hopkins said that they are very comfortable being constrained to the proportions and heights.

Chairperson O'Donnell said if they approve this elevation, they would still have to come back to the Commission if there were changes to the details.

Commissioner Petersen said he is arguing the proportions, the aesthetics, the design, the appearance, and the height.

Mr. Hopkins said that they are asking for the maximum they will need for the structural alternate that they are exploring. If they took a foot out, they would have to take a hard look at how it would change proportionally.

Commissioner Petersen said if they were to approve it tonight, it would be approved at that height, not to be changed. They would have to bring any changes back to the Commission.

Ms. Tennant, Zoning Coordinator, said that this is the approach that is taken with every project. They approve what is in front of them, not everything that could happen in the future. New plans have to come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Kozak said they are asking for more detailed elevations.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said he is not happy with the sample window they brought in. He prefers to see an actual window with historic proportions.

Chairperson O'Donnell said it looks like the meeting will be continued until next Thursday. The Commission is asking for larger scale, more detailed sections. They are inclined to approve the concept of the project as a two-story. They would like the water table on Building #1 at the floor.

Ms. Tenant asked if the architects can bring in their drawings next week, as they will obviously need time to work on them and would like to proceed.

Chairperson O'Donnell said that since they have a meeting scheduled next week, they will continue the petition until then.

Mr. Kramer said he will need to report to the Plan Commission on the direction of the ARC, in the two-story version. He said that for the Shoppes of Flint Creek, three separate plans were approved. When Heinen's came in, they had to come back to the Commission with the changes to the façade.

Chairperson O'Donnell said that as presented today, they do not like the proposal for a three-story building.

Commissioner Kozak said he is expecting them to come back with more details. He doubts that they will be able to make a decision next week. He expects to see another option on the three-story.

Mr. Hopkins said that they will bring back all of the details as discussed.

Commissioner Petersen said he will not be able to attend the December 13th meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Petersen and seconded by Commissioner Kozak to continue ARC 12-10 to December 13, 2012 at 7 pm.

Roll Call Vote: Commissioner Petersen, yes; Commission Plummer, yes; Commissioner Lytle, yes, Commissioner Kozak, yes; Commissioner Geissler, absent; Vice Chairperson Coath, yes; Chairperson O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 6-0. The motion carried.

#####

Approval of the 2013 ARC Meeting Schedule

Commissioner Kozak made a motion to approve the 2013 ARC Meeting Schedule, Commissioner Petersen seconded the motion. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

Approval of Minutes

November 8, 2012

Commissioner Kozak made a motion to approve the November 8, 2012 meeting minutes, as amended, Commissioner Petersen seconded the motion. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

Planners Report

No report.

#####

Adjournment

There being no additional business to come before the Board, a motion was duly made by Commissioner Petersen and seconded by Commissioner Kozak to adjourn the meeting at 9:59 p.m. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Emerick
Recording Secretary


Chairperson O'Donnell
Architectural Review Commission

Approval Date: January 24, 2013